

DREIER STEIN KAHAN  
BROWNE WOODS GEORGE LLP

DREIER STEIN KAHAN  
BROWNE WOODS GEORGE LLP

Allan Browne (No. 34923)

Sonia Y. Lee (No. 191837)

450 North Roxbury Drive

7th Floor

Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Telephone: 310.274.7400

Facsimile: 310.275.5697

[abrowne@dskbwg.com](mailto:abrowne@dskbwg.com)

[slee@dskbwg.com](mailto:slee@dskbwg.com)

Attorneys for Defendants

Denice Halicki, The Original Gone in 60

Seconds, LLC, Halicki Films, LLC, and Eleanor

Licensing, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HST AUTOMOTIVE, LLC, a  
California limited liability company;  
and RONALE, INC., a Nevada  
corporation,,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DENISE HALICKI, an individual;  
THE ORIGINAL GONE IN 60  
SECONDS, LLC, Delaware limited  
liability company; HALICKI  
FILMS, LLC, a California limited  
liability company; ELEANOR  
LICENSING, LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company; and DOES  
1-10, inclusive,,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 08 CV 0337 JAH RBB

**NOTICE OF RELATED CASES**

Defendants Denice Halicki, The Original Gone in 60 Seconds LLC, Halicki Films LLC, and Eleanor Licensing, LLC (collectively, "the Halicki Parties"), by their counsel, hereby state that this action is related to the following cases:

1. *Denice Shakarian Halicki, The Original Gone in 60 Seconds, LLC and Halicki Films, LLC v. Carroll Shelby, Carroll Shelby International, Inc., Carroll Shelby Licensing, Inc., Carroll Shelby Engineering, Inc., Carroll Shelby Motors, Inc., Carroll Shelby Distribution International, Inc., Carroll Hall Shelby Trust, Unique Motorcars, Inc., Unique Performance, Inc., Sanderson Sales & Marketing, and DOES 2 through 10, inclusive*, USDC Case No. CV-04-8813 (the "First Shelby Action");

2. *Denice Shakarian Halicki, The Original Gone in 60 Seconds, LLC, Halicki Films, LLC and Eleanor Licensing, LLC v. Carroll Shelby, Carroll Shelby International, Inc., Carroll Shelby Licensing, Inc., Carroll Shelby Engineering, Inc., Carroll Shelby Motors, Inc., Carroll Shelby Distribution International, Inc., Carroll Hall Shelby Trust, Unique Motorcars, Inc., Unique Performance, Inc., Sanderson Sales & Marketing, Steve Sanderson, Sanderson C&C Ltd., and DOES 4 through 10, inclusive*, USDC Case No. CV-07-6859 (the "Second Shelby Action"); and

3. *Denice Shakarian Halicki, The Original Gone in 60 Seconds, LLC, Halicki Films, LLC and Eleanor Licensing, LLC v. Edward Monfort, an individual; Ronaele Mustang, Inc., a Florida corporation; Ronaele, LLC, a Georgia limited liability company; Ronaele, Inc., a Nevada corporation; HST Automotive, LLC, a California limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive*, USDC Case No. CV08-0351 PSG (JTLx) (the "First Ronaele Action").

The First Shelby Action was filed on October 25, 2005, is the first filed of these related cases and was assigned to the Honorable James Otero, sitting in the United States District Court, Central District of California. The Second Shelby Action was filed on October 23, 2007, and, following the filing of the Notice of

DREIER STEIN KAHAN  
BROWNE WOODS GEORGE LLP

1 Related Cases by the Halicki Parties, the case was transferred to and also assigned  
2 to the Honorable James Otero.

3 The First Ronaele Action was filed by the Halicki Parties in the United States  
4 District Court, Central District of California, on January 18, 2008 and assigned to  
5 the Honorable Judge Philip S. Gutierrez in the United States District Court, Central  
6 District of California. On February 25, 2008, the Halicki Parties filed a Notice of  
7 Related Cases in the First Ronaele Action seeking, for the reasons listed below, to  
8 transfer to case to Judge Otero. The request to transfer the First Ronaele Action is  
9 currently pending.

10 In the First and Second Shelby Actions and the First Ronaele Action, the  
11 Halicki parties seek to enforce their intellectual property rights against alleged  
12 infringers. The plaintiffs in the three actions are identical. Further, the intellectual  
13 property in this action as well as all of the aforementioned cases are based upon the  
14 same copyright, trademarks and trade dress. This action, as well as the  
15 aforementioned cases, arise from the same or substantially identical infringing  
16 actions of the defendants in producing, manufacturing and selling "knock offs" of  
17 the Halicki Parties' protected intellectual property.

18 As set forth in the First Amended Complaint in the Second Shelby Action  
19 and the First Ronaele Action, which are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B for the  
20 Court's convenience, the Halicki Parties are the exclusive holders of the copyrights  
21 in and to, among other things, the 1974 original motion picture "Gone in 60  
22 Seconds" (the "Original Movie"), the character of "Eleanor" from the Original and  
23 the 2000 remake of "Gone in 60 Seconds" by Hollywood Pictures (the "Remake"),  
24 the "Gone in 60 Seconds" and "Eleanor" trademarks, and the "Eleanor" trade dress.  
25 The central issue in all four of the actions, including the instant action, involves the  
26 rights in and to the look, mark, name, and character of "Eleanor" from the Remake.

27 Eleanor as she appears in the Remake is a vintage Ford Fastback Mustang  
28 which was "tricked out" for the movie to look like a "futuristic movie version" of a

1 Ford Mustang Shelby GT500, a car developed and produced under the leadership of  
2 Lee Iacocca, who became known as the “Father of the Mustang.” However,  
3 Eleanor in the Remake is not an authentic 1967 Shelby Mustang. Not only was  
4 Eleanor’s body or shell not built utilizing an authentic Shelby Mustang, Eleanor in  
5 the Remake contained various design elements that were unique to Eleanor, which  
6 do not appear on any stock versions of the Ford Fastbacks or the Shelby GT500s.  
7 There has never been an Eleanor in the Original Movie or the Remake that was  
8 built from a Shelby GT500.

9 Eleanor was purposefully and conspicuously featured on all promotional,  
10 marketing, advertising and merchandising materials for the Remake, including,  
11 among other things, movie posters, DVD covers, CD covers, and banners.  
12 Additionally, Eleanor from the Remake as well as Eleanor from the Original Movie  
13 have continuously made appearances at various shows and events throughout the  
14 nation. The Halicki Parties have continuously and consistently maintained  
15 protection over the Eleanor character and “Gone in 60 Seconds,” whether in the  
16 Original Movie or the Remake. As a result of the Original Movie, the Remake, and  
17 all of the efforts of the Halicki Parties to promote, market and commercialize  
18 Eleanor, the character of Eleanor and the name and mark of “Eleanor” became  
19 indelibly linked and inseparable in the minds of the public with the movie itself.  
20 Thus, “Eleanor” has acquired a distinctiveness and a secondary meaning with the  
21 consumers. Indeed, she has become an iconic character that is highly coveted and  
22 sought after by car enthusiasts throughout the country and abroad.

23 In or about 2002, the defendants in the First and Second Shelby Actions,  
24 including, but not limited to Carroll Shelby (collectively, the “Shelby Parties”),  
25 began producing, manufacturing, marketing and selling illegal, knock-offs of  
26 Eleanor. As set forth in the First Amended Complaint in the Second Shelby Action,  
27 the Shelby Parties make no pretense or apologies about their blatant infringement of  
28 the Halicki Parties’ trademark or copyright in the Remake or in Eleanor. At no

1 time, did the Shelby Parties even attempt to claim that their knock-off vehicles were  
2 originals or that they were not identical duplicates of Eleanor from the Remake. To  
3 the contrary, in sworn deposition testimony given in a related action, the Shelby  
4 Parties admitted that they first learned about Eleanor (and got their idea to rip off  
5 Eleanor) after seeing her in the Remake.

6 Further, despite the fact that the Halicki Parties are the prior users of the  
7 "Eleanor" mark and the defendants knew they had no right to such a mark,  
8 defendant Carroll Hall Shelby Trust deliberately and wrongfully registered the  
9 "Eleanor" trademark with the Patent and Trademark Office, registration number  
10 2837333, for "vehicles, namely, automobiles, engines for automobiles, and  
11 structural parts for automobiles." Defendant Carroll Hall Shelby Trust also applied  
12 for a registration for the "Eleanor" trademark for "toys, namely, die-cast metal  
13 model cars" in 2001, but subsequently abandoned the registration. Defendant  
14 Carroll Shelby personally signed at least one of these applications.

15 In defense to the First and Second Shelby Actions initiated by the Halicki  
16 Parties, the Shelby Parties contend that the Halicki Parties' claims are without merit  
17 because, by virtue of his registration of the false mark, Carroll Shelby is the proper  
18 holder of the trademark "Eleanor."

19 Along with the improper registration of the "Eleanor" mark, the Shelby  
20 Parties began a nation-wide advertising and promotional campaign designed to  
21 mislead and defraud the public as to the origin and ownership of Eleanor. This  
22 advertising and promotional campaign deliberately and intentionally sought to  
23 falsely establish Carroll Shelby as the creator, developer, producer and owner of  
24 Eleanor, and the rights holder to the character, mark, look, and dress of Eleanor. As  
25 a result of the Shelby Parties' wrongful conduct, the public is, indeed, confused as  
26 to the true owners of the intellectual property rights in and to "Eleanor."

27 This is made abundantly clear by the actions of the defendants in the First  
28 Ronaele Action. Subsequent to the filing of the Second Shelby Action, the Halicki

1 Parties discovered that the defendants in the First Ronaele Action, including, but  
2 not limited to, HST Automotive, Inc. and Ronaele, Inc. (collectively, “HST  
3 Parties”), the plaintiffs in the instant action, were also producing, manufacturing,  
4 marketing and selling illegal, knock-offs of Eleanor. The only difference between  
5 the actions of the HST Parties and the Shelby Parties was that the HST Parties  
6 sought to superficially avoid a claim of trademark infringement by calling their car  
7 “Ronaele.” However, as admitted by the HST Parties, “Ronaele” is simply  
8 “Eleanor” spelled backwards and the HST Parties’ cars are advertised and billed as  
9 “Eleanor” from “Gone in 60 Seconds.”

10 Thus, on January 18, 2008, the Halicki Parties filed the First Ronaele Action  
11 for, among other things, copyright infringement, trademark infringement and unfair  
12 competition.

13 In defense to the First Ronaele Action, on or about February 21, 2008, the  
14 HST Parties filed the instant Complaint for Declaratory Judgment of Non-  
15 Infringement of Trademark, Trade Dress, and Copyright (the “Second Ronaele  
16 Action”). In the complaint, the HST Parties seek a declaration from the Court that  
17 they did not infringe any copyright or trademark in and to “Eleanor” because such  
18 rights are owned by Carroll Shelby. (*See, e.g.*, Complaint, ¶ 19, at 4:1-3, ¶ 15 [*sic*],  
19 at 4:11-13.) The Second Ronaele Action is simply an affirmative defense to the  
20 claims asserted against the HST Parties by the Halicki Parties in the First Ronaele  
21 Action, and is an improper attempt to forum shop. Further, this defense asserted by  
22 the HST Parties in the Second Ronaele Action mirrors the defense of the Shelby  
23 Parties in the First and Second Shelby Actions.

1 Accordingly, the four cases call for determination of the same or  
2 substantially identical questions of law and fact. If the cases were heard by  
3 different Courts, it would entail substantial duplication of labor and may potentially  
4 result in inconsistent rulings. Thus, for matter of judicial economy and efficiency,  
5 the Halicki Parties respectfully request that the instant case be transferred to the  
6 Honorable James Otero sitting in the United States District Court, Central District  
7 of California. At a minimum, the Halicki Parties respectfully request that the  
8 instant case be transferred to the Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez in the United States  
9 District Court, Central District of California, as the instant case is simply an  
10 affirmative defense and/or compulsory counterclaims to the First Ronaele Action.  
11

12 DATED: March 11, 2008

DREIER STEIN KAHAN BROWNE WOODS  
GEORGE LLP

13 By \_\_\_\_\_/s/

14 Sonia Y. Lee  
15 Attorneys for Defendants  
16 Denice Halicki, The Original Gone in 60  
17 Seconds, LLC, Halicki Films, LLC, and  
18 Eleanor Licensing, LLC  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DREIER STEIN KAHAN  
BROWNE WOODS GEORGE LLP